

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 14, 2005. Claims 8 to 10, 18 to 20, 22 and 25 to 37 are in the application, of which Claims 8, 18, 22, 24, 28, 34 and 37 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

A formal objection was lodged against the claims, and a suggestion was made to rephrase the claims so as to read “communication with the computer is to be made”. This suggestion has been adopted.

Claims 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The rejection is respectfully traversed, especially insofar as it applies to independent Claim 22 (Claim 21 has been cancelled without prejudice). In particular, Claim 22 very clearly recites a “recording medium which stores a control program ...” such that the basis for the rejection is not understood. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 1, 11, 21, 22 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent 6,219,706 (Fan), and independent Claims 8, 18 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Fan and U.S. Patent 6,530,025 (Nakagawa). The remaining claims are all dependent, and were rejected over Fan or over Fan in various combinations with Nakagawa, U.S. Patent 5,646,872 (Yonenaga), or an article entitled “IANA Well-Known Port Numbers”.

In response, Claims 1 to 7, 11 to 17, 21, 23 and 24 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and without conceding the correctness of the rejection. In addition, independent Claims 8, 18 and 22 have all been amended so as to emphasize that a port number is specified, in correspondence to a kind of data process, from among plural port numbers respectively allocated in correspondence to plural kinds of data processes. In addition, new claims have been added, including new independent Claims 28, 34 and 37. In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested, as explained more fully below.

The invention concern data processing in which a computer communicates with a data processing apparatus via a network by using any one of plural port numbers respectively allocated in correspondence to plural kinds of data processes that are executable by the data processing apparatus. According to one aspect of the invention as defined in independent Claims 8, 18 and 22, one of the plural port numbers is specified, and it is specified in correspondence to the kind of data process to be executed from among the plural port numbers respectively allocated in correspondence to the plural kinds of data processes. The port number is notified to the computer, and the data process is executed in accordance with data that is transmitted to the specified port number. In a related aspect of the invention as set out in independent Claims 28, 34 and 37, one of the plural port numbers is specified, and it is specified in correspondence to a kind of data process received from the computer from among the plural port numbers respectively allocated in correspondence to the plural kinds of data processes. The computer is notified of the port

number, and the designated data process is executed according to an indication that the port number to which the data is transferred is the port number notified to the computer.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the foregoing characterizing features of the present invention, particularly with respect to a specification of a port number in correspondence to a kind of data process, wherein the port number is specified from among plural port numbers respectively allocated in correspondence to plural kinds of data processes executable by a data processing apparatus. Fan discloses a firewall which permits or inhibits communication with an external node based on the IP address and the port number transmitted from the external node. However, the relevant firewall in Fan does not specify the port number corresponding to a kind of data process, and it does not specify the port number from among plural port numbers respectively allocated in correspondence to plural kinds of data processes executable by the firewall. Moreover, since Fan is a firewall, it also does not notify a computer of a port number, since such a characteristic would most likely defeat the entire purpose of Fan's firewalling functionality.

Nakagawa describes an authentication checking server which authenticates by receiving a user ID and password from a client and thereafter notifying the client of the port number to be used for connection. However, in Nakagawa, the authentication checking server does not specify the port number corresponding to a kind of data process, wherein the port number is specified from among plural port numbers respectively allocated in correspondence to plural kinds of data processes that are executable by the authentication checking server. It is, in particular, to be noted that Nakagawa assigns a port

number at “random”, as specified at step 6 of Figure 11. It is therefore evident that Nakagawa does not assign a port number in correspondence to a kind of data process to be executed, but rather assigns a port number at “random”

The “IANA Well-Known Port Numbers” provides a list of well-known ports corresponding to well-known services. Yonenaga describes a computer which is also equipped with a printer. Neither describes anything of pertinence to the above-noted deficiencies of Fan and Nakagawa, particularly as regards specification of one of plural port numbers that corresponds to a kind of data process, wherein the port number is specified from among plural port numbers respectively allocated in correspondence to plural kinds of data processes executable by a data processing apparatus.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the claims herein define subject matter that would not have been obvious from any permissible combination of the applied art, and allowance of the claims is therefore respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael K O'Neill", is written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant
Michael K O'Neill
Registration No.: 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 112230v1